REMARKS

Claims 1-19 are pending in the present application. Claims 1-4, 6-11, 13-16 and 18 have been amended as a result of this response. Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1, 10, 16 and 18 and dependent claims 2-9, 11-15, 17 and 19 stand in condition for allowance. No claims have been canceled and no new claims have been added.

I. Claim Objections

The Examiner has objected to claims 1, 10, 16 and 18 for not clearly claiming which are the processes A through D. Claims 1, 10, 16 and 18 have been amended and should be in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the objection.

II. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-3, 5, 6, 9-14, 18 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Bassett et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,010,492). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Bassett et al. teaches a method and apparatus for dynamic distribution of controlled and additional selective overlays in a streaming media. "From a plurality of related streams, streams are selected to send to each respective client based on the respective profile" (Abstract). Bassett teaches a system that is directed towards tailoring a multimedia presentation on a multimedia data processing system (Col. 5, lines 41-46). Bassett accomplishes the described method by "breaking up a program...into different data streams for different audio and video components" (Col. 5, lines 41-50). It is possible for information streams to be received and selectively displayed in association with the program (Col 5, lines 54-61). This process allows for customization of a program through controlling the data stream without having to broadcast multiple versions of an event to different views (Col 5, lines 54-61).

Bassett discusses timing in that: a time stamp could be used (which is generally an indication of the time at which a certain event occurred), a spike within the both data streams that appears in the periodic rate, or even cyclic redundancy check where certain calculated values are placed in the headers of both data streams (Col. 10, line 62 to Col. 11, line). Bassett does not discuss the timing of each frame of the moving-image data as claimed.

The present invention discusses a moving-image synthesis method and device. A storage area stores different types of data. The control-data-for-synthesis is read from storage and in accordance with the parameters within the header of the control-data-for-synthesis the image-data-for-synthesis is read from storage at a timing based on the input timing of the moving-image data, and a composite image is produced. The control-data-for synthesis is a header that may include a number of different parameters such as: a horizontal position of image-for-synthesis, a vertical position of image-for-synthesis, a horizontal size of image-for-syntheses, a vertical size of image-for-synthesis, pointer information pointing at the current image-data-for-synthesis, pointer information pointing at the next control-data-for-synthesis, and a repetition count of current image-for-synthesis (Specification page 15, lines 25-32). The moving-image control signal includes different timing information such as: a clock, a horizontal synchronization signal, and a vertical synchronization signal, of the video signal is input to the synthesis controller to control the timing of the frames throughout the system (Specification page 10, line 30 to page 11, line 21).

Bassett fails to teach a moving-image synthesis device, which receives a video signal, "which includes moving-image data and a moving-image control signal including display timing information of each frame of the moving-image data" (Claims 1, 10, 16 and 18). In addition, Bassett fails to teach a moving-image synthesis device, which processes "data-for-synthesis recursively" (Claims 1, 10, 16 and 18). Bassett also fails to teach a moving-image synthesis device, which stores "data-for-synthesis, which includes a plurality of items of control-data-for-synthesis associated with the plurality of items of the image-data-for-synthesis" (Claims 1, 10, 16 and 18). Bassett fails to teach a moving-image synthesis device which reads at least one of the plurality of items of the control-data-for-synthesis from the storage "at a timing based on the moving-image control signal, where the control-data-for-synthesis includes pointer information pointing to the next control-data-for-synthesis and repetition count of current image for synthesis" (Claims 1, 10, 16 and 18). In addition, Bassett fails to teach a moving-image synthesis device which reads "the image-data-for-synthesis in accordance with the read control-data-for-synthesis" from the storage "at a timing in accordance with the input timing of the moving-image data" (Claims 1, 10, 16 and 18). Also, Bassett fails to teach a moving-image synthesis device

which executes processing to "synthesize one frame of the moving-image data and the read image-data-for-synthesis forming a composite image" (Claims 1, 10, 16 and 18).

Accordingly, for at least these reasons, claims 1, 10 and 18 are clearly distinguishable over Bassett et al. Applicants submit that claims 2-3, 5, 6, 9, 11-14, and 19 are allowable at least by virtue of their dependency on claims 1, 10 and 18. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

III. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Examiner has rejected claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bassett et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,010,491). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Bassett in view of obviousness does not remedy the noted deficiencies of Bassett as applied to claim 1 and is only relied upon to teach dependent claim features. Accordingly, for at least these reasons, claim 4 is clearly distinguishable over Bassett in view of obviousness. Applicants submit that claim 4 is allowable at least by virtue of its dependency on claim 1. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

IV. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Examiner has rejected claims 7, 8 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bassett et al. as applied to claims 1-3, 5, 6-15, 18 and 19, and further in view of Woodson (PGPUB Document No. US 2002/0122045). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Woodson does not remedy the noted deficiencies of Bassett et al. Woodson is only relied upon to teach dependent claim features. This reliance on Woodson fails to make up for the deficiencies of Bassett et al. discussed above with respect to independent claims 1, 10 and 18. Therefore, the asserted combination of Bassett et al. and Woodson (assuming these references may be combined, which Applicants do not admit) fails to establish prima facie obviousness of any pending claim.

Accordingly, for at least these reasons, claims 7, 8 and 15 are clearly distinguishable over Bassett et al. in view of Woodson. Applicants submit that claims 7, 8 and 15 are allowable at

least by virtue of their dependency on claims 1 and 10. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

V. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Examiner has rejected claims 16 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bassett et al. and Woodson et al. as applied to claims 1-3, 5, 6-15, 18 and 19, and further in view of Reisman (PGPUB Document No. US 2004/0031058). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Reisman and Woodson do not remedy the noted deficiencies of Bassett et al. Reisman and Woodson are only relied upon to teach additional claim features. This reliance on Reisman and Woodson fails to make up for the deficiencies of Bassett et al. discussed above with respect to independent claims 1, 10 and 18. Therefore, the asserted combination of Bassett et al. in view of Woodson and further in view of Reisman (assuming these references may be combined, which Applicants do not admit) fails to establish prima facie obviousness of any pending claim.

Accordingly, for at least these reasons, claims 16 and 17 are clearly distinguishable over Bassett et al. in view of Woodson and in further view of Reisman. Applicants submit that claim 17 is allowable at least by virtue of its dependency on claim 16. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

VI. Conclusion.

All matters having been addressed in view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request the entry of this Amendment, the Examiner's reconsideration of this application, and the immediate allowance of all pending claims.

Applicants' undersigned representative remains ready to assist the Examiner in any way to facilitate and expedite the prosecution of this matter. If any point remains an issue in which the Examiner feels would be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, please contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Please charge any fees associated with the submission of this paper to Deposit Account No. 02-2448. The Commissioner for Patents is also authorized to credit any overpayments to the above-referenced deposit account.

Dated: June 2, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By _____

D. Richard Anderson
Registration No.: 40,439
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP
8110 Gatehouse Road
Suite 100 East
P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000
Attorney for Applicant